



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,982	07/25/2001	Edward O. Lee	10002421-1	8176

7590 09/14/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,982

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment 5/17/2005.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-30 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 3/7/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. There is no copy of foreign patent GB 2 300 991 A.

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 7/25/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2178

6. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claims 1, 10, and 19 recite the limitation "the presentation of the publication" in lines 5, 5, and 9 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. There is no previous "presentation of the publication" in the claims to refer to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-30 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dodge et al, hereinafter Dodge (Pat.# 5,655,130, 8/15/1997).

Regarding independent claim 1, Dodge teaches creating documentation, which includes several variations elements of a document, in a computer, such as a server—*associating a content item with a publication in the server* -- (col.6, lines 42-67, col.7 , lines 1-67, col.8, line 65-col.9, line 20).

Furthermore, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database, storing the documentation, by filtering or excluding unwanted platform-specific variation(s) of a document from several platform-specific document variations to be presented to a user on a

Art Unit: 2178

certain computer platform, such as PC, or Unix paragraphs *—identifying a presentation platform from a number of potential presentation platforms for the presentation of the publication—* located in the database. The output document contains at least one variation-specific data element on a certain computer platform, such as PC, or Unix paragraphs—*content item in a format recognizable by the presentation platform --*. The filtering or extraction of the output document is done at a file server (col.6, lines 57-67, col.7, lines 1-67, col.8, line 65-col.9, line 20, col.11, lines 8-67, fig. 2-3, 9a-b).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to indicate the filtering or exclusion of unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, etc to be presented to an audience., (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-67, fig. 2-3, 9a-b). In other words, a filter parses, selects and extracts platform-specific documentation from a database containing multiple document variation elements or paragraphs, based on a user request or indication.

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to filter or exclude unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, audience etc., (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to filter or exclude

Art Unit: 2178

unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, audience etc., from a file server using a filter located on a client workstation (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.9, lines 11-20, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the checking of boxes—*identifying publication identifier in a publication request--* associated with platform specific documentation, and filtering out from a database the documentation—*searching a content database from the content item based upon the publication identifier--* whose checkbox was not checked (col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.9, lines 1-20, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the encapsulation of SGML data elements belonging to four different platforms into a source data file—*generating at least one intermediate file, wherein the content item is associated with the intermediate file.* Boxes are checked, which are associated with platform specific documentation (to be used in a computer platform compatible by such documentation, such as a pc, unix computer, etc.), which causes the filtering from, a database or source file of platform-specific document- whose checkbox was not checked, into a platform-specific document—*transforming the at least one intermediate file into the output file-* (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches that boxes—*publication identifier--* are checked, which are associated with platform specific documentation (to be used in a computer platform compatible by such documentation, such as a pc, unix computer—

Art Unit: 2178

presentation platform identifier, etc.), which causes the filtering out from a database or source file of platform-specific document whose checkbox was not checked (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 6, Dodge teaches the encapsulation of SGML data elements belonging to four different platform in a source data file—*populating the content item into the intermediate file* (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Regarding claim 9, which depends on claim 7, Dodge teaches that boxes—*publication identifier*-- are checked, which are associated with platform specific documentation (to be used in a computer platform compatible by such documentation, such as a pc, unix computer—*presentation platform identifier*, etc.), which causes the filtering out from a server database, a platform-specific source file, whose checkbox was not checked (col.6, lines 32-67, col.7, lines 1-17, 51-67, col.9, lines 1-20, col.11, lines 8-23, 44-67, fig. 2-3).

Claims 10-18 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-9 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 19-27 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-9 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 1, Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database storing the documentation, by allowing a user to indicate the filtering or exclusion of unwanted data variation elements, such as PC, Unix, audience etc., and outputting a document, such as a document having text indicating information of each platform—*each of the content items comprises an amount of text that is platform generic with respect to each of the potential presentation platforms* (col.6, lines 43-67, fig. 2-3). In other words, a filter parses, selects and extracts platform-specific documentation, along with text, from a database containing multiple document variation elements or paragraphs, based on a user request or indication.

Claims 29-30 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 28, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, the Applicant argues that Dodge fails to show or suggest at least the element of identifying a presentation platform from a number of potential presentation platforms upon which to present the publication (page 8). The Examiner disagrees, because Dodge teaches the generation of an output document from a database, storing the documentation, by filtering or excluding unwanted platform-specific variation(s) of a document from several platform-specific document variations to be presented to a user on a certain computer platform,

Art Unit: 2178

such as PC, or Unix paragraphs *—identifying a presentation platform from a number of potential presentation platforms for the presentation of the publication—*located in the database. The output document contains at least one variation-specific data element, such as PC, or Unix paragraphs *—content item in a format recognizable by the presentation platform --*. The filtering or extraction of the output document is done at a file server, by choosing the platform on which to present the document (col.6, lines 57-67, col.7, lines 1-67, col.8, line 65-col.9, line 20, col.11, lines 8-67, fig. 2-3, 9a-b).

Conclusion

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2178

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:


Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)


CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/7/05